

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 15, 1989

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Barbara St. Andrews, Episcopal Diocese of California, San Francisco, CA, offered the following prayer:

Holy One, whose purpose is love, we pause at the beginning of this new day, mindful of the responsibilities You entrust to all those who lead and asking for Your enabling strength and discernment. Cleanse the windows of perception, O Lord, that beyond issues and divisions we may seek the whole and not the partial and find with compassion the common purpose of Thy will. Grant to those who govern quiet centered certainty, pure heart, clear conscience, and genuine faith. Through the power of Thy Spirit, lift us from rushing restlessness to mountaintop visions. Disturb us with Your challenge to human power and privilege; remind us of selflessness and service; guide and heal us in all our individual needs; and unite us in comprehending possibilities we refuse to see. Unleash the unlikely in and through us, and make us always grateful for the benefits of Your prevailing grace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], please come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. HOUGHTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolutions:

S. RES. 123

Resolved, That section 6 of Senate Resolution 38, One Hundred First Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. The actual and necessary expenses of the committee, including the employment of staff at an annual rate of pay, and the employment of consultants with

prior approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration at a rate not to exceed the maximum daily rate for a standing committee of the Senate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriation account "Miscellaneous Items" upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that no voucher shall be required to pay the salary of any employee who is compensated at an annual rate of pay."

S. RES. 127

Resolved, That a summons shall be issued which commands Walter L. Nixon, Jr., to file with the Secretary of the Senate an answer to the articles of impeachment no later than May 31, 1989, and thereafter to abide by, obey, and perform such orders, directions, and judgments as the Senate shall make in the premises, according to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Sec. 2. The Sergeant at Arms is authorized to utilize the services of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms or another employee of the Senate in serving the summons.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives of the filing of the answer and shall provide a copy of the answer to the House.

Sec. 4. The Managers on the part of the House may file with the Secretary of the Senate a replication no later than June 12, 1989.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall notify counsel for Walter L. Nixon, Jr., of the filing of a replication, and shall provide counsel with a copy.

Sec. 6. The Secretary shall provide the answer and the replication, if any, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate on the first day the Senate is in session after the Secretary receives them, and the Presiding Officer shall cause the answer and replication, if any, to be printed in the Senate Journal and in the Congressional Record. If a timely answer has not been filed the Presiding Officer shall cause a plea of not guilty to be entered.

Sec. 7. The articles of impeachment, the answer, and the replication, if any, together with the provisions of the Constitution on impeachment, and the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials, shall be printed under the direction of the Secretary as a Senate document.

Sec. 8. The provisions of this resolution shall govern notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials.

Sec. 9. The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives of this resolution.

S. RES. 128

Resolved, That pursuant to rule XI of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials, the Presiding Officer shall appoint a committee of twelve Senators to perform the duties and to exercise the powers provided for in the rule.

Sec. 2. The majority and minority leader shall each recommend six members to the

Presiding Officer for appointment to the committee. The committee shall designate one of its members to be chairman and one of its members to be vice chairman.

Sec. 3. The committee shall be deemed to be a standing committee of the Senate for the purpose of reporting to the Senate resolutions for the criminal or civil enforcement of the committee's subpoenas or orders, and for the purpose of printing reports, hearings, and other documents for submission to the Senate under rule XI.

Sec. 4. During proceedings conducted under rule XI the chairman of the committee is authorized to waive the requirement under the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials that questions by a Senator to a witness, a manager, or counsel shall be reduced to writing and put by the presiding officer.

Sec. 5. In addition to a certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings and testimony had and given before it, the committee is authorized to report to the Senate a statement of facts that are uncontested and a summary, with appropriate references to the record, of evidence that the parties have introduced on contested issues of fact.

Sec. 6. The actual and necessary expenses of the committee, including the employment of staff at an annual rate of pay, and the employment of consultants with prior approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration at a rate not to exceed the maximum daily rate for a standing committee of the Senate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriation account "Miscellaneous Items" upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that no voucher shall be required to pay the salary of any employee who is compensated at an annual rate of pay.

Sec. 7. The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives and counsel for Judge Walter L. Nixon, Jr., of this resolution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution designating May 29, 1989, as the "National Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the U.S.S. Iowa."

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Resolution 128, 101st Congress, the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the majority leader and the minority leader, appoints Mr. FOWLER, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. MACK, as members of the committee to receive and report evidence in the impeachment of Judge Walter L. Nixon, Jr., judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 968. An act to delay the effective date of section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution urging first asylum countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] to reinstate the practice of providing refuge to all asylum-seekers from Vietnam, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Washington, DC., May 11, 1989.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,

The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope from the White House at 5:14 p.m. on Thursday, May 11, 1989, and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 1988 annual report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONNOLD K. ANDERSON,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1988.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 11, 1989.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 106, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until 5 p.m. today, May 15, 1989, to file a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Gov-

ernment for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

NATCHER HAS NEVER ACCEPTED A CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

(Mr. NATCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, in a story that appeared in the Washington Post on May 11, 1989, entitled "PAC Support Scoreboard: The House," I am listed as having accepted \$8,507 of PAC support. The story starts out with the statement that "during last year's campaign season, every Member of the House received contributions from political action committees, either in direct cash contributions or indirectly through independent expenditures made by a PAC in support of a candidate, according to a Washington Post computer analysis of data collected by the Federal Election Commission through the end of 1988."

I have never accepted a campaign contribution since I have been a Member of Congress and none have been accepted for me. On a great many occasions I have returned contributions that were sent to me and this is disclosed in the records of the Clerk's Office here in the House of Representatives and in the office of the Federal Election Commission.

The article referred to pertains to the 1988 election of Members of Congress. During the year of 1988, I spent out of my own funds \$8,404.97. In the primary election that year I spent out of my own funds \$5,728.94 and in the 1988 general election I spent out of my own funds the sum of \$2,767.03. Mr. Speaker, I have completed 35 years and 10 months as a Member of Congress and have never accepted campaign contributions.

After reading the article in the Post, I contacted Donald Anderson, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, calling his attention to the article in the Post and then I contacted the Federal Election Commission. The record in the Clerk's Office shows that I have never accepted a campaign contribution since I have been a Member of Congress. This is a public record as you and I know, Mr. Speaker, and any reporter from any newspaper can check this record. In contacting the Federal Election Commission about the story that appeared in the Post, one of the Commissioners, Scott E. Thomas, had the records checked at the Commission and on the same date,

May 11, 1989, directed a letter to me as follows:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION,

Washington, DC, May 11, 1989.

Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NATCHER: As a follow-up to our conversation today, I have enclosed a 1988 and 1990 Federal Election Commission (FEC) computer summary of reported activity affecting your 1988 campaign. The 1988 summary probably was utilized by the Washington Post. This summary can be broken down into three categories: PAC contributions reportedly sent to your 1988 campaign; communication costs made by labor organizations on your behalf; and independent expenditures made by a PAC on your behalf.

The 1988 computer summary indicates that the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees—PEOPLE; Marion Laboratories Inc., Political Action Committee; Pepsi-Cola General Bottlers PAC; and Travelers Corporation PAC sent contributions of \$1,000, \$300, \$250, and \$1,500, respectively, to your committee. The computer summary indicates that your 1988 committee returned these four contributions to the sending PAC. The computer summary further indicates that the Build Political Action Committee of the National Association of Home Builders reported making a \$1,000 contribution to your 1988 committee. That committee's reports that appear on the 1988 summary apparently don't reflect any return, refund, or voiding of that contribution. The 1990 computer summary, however, does reflect the voiding of Build Political Action Committee's contribution in that committee's 1990 cycle reports.

The computer summary indicates that the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO (D.C.); the Committee on Letter Carriers Political Education; the Kentucky State AFL-CIO; and the United Mine Workers of America Coal Miners Political Action Committee made communication costs of \$2,671, \$45, \$2,829 and \$18 on your behalf for a total of \$5,563.

Finally, the computer summary indicates that the National Committee to Preserve Social Security PAC made two independent expenditures of \$1,057 and \$887 on your behalf for a total of \$1,944.

It appears that the Washington Post figure of \$8,507 was reached by adding the \$1,000 contribution reportedly made by the Home Builders PAC together with the communication costs (\$5,563) and independent expenditures (\$1,944). To the extent that the Post article categorized as contributions from political action committees the communication costs and independent expenditures, it is simply inaccurate.

I have also enclosed FEC brochures that describe the FEC computerized information, independent expenditures and labor organization communications. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 376-5118.

Sincerely,

SCOTT E. THOMAS,

Commissioner.

In the last paragraph in the Washington Post story we find this statement:

In some cases where the total contribution is small, the amount represents independent expenditures on behalf of a candidate by a

PAC and not direct contributions, which a number of House Members refuse to accept.

I have never accepted contributions from any PAC and no PAC has ever received authority from me to spend any money or anything of value in support of my candidacy at any time since I have been a Member of Congress.

I am proud of the record I have established and I do not intend to permit my record to be altered or changed by virtue of allegations that money was expended by some individual or organization in support of my candidacy which was unknown by me and without my knowledge or consent.

Mr. Speaker, I have never accepted a campaign contribution and no one has accepted any for me since I have been a Member of the Congress.

NORIEGA'S ESCAPE ROUTE

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, from what I have read in recent days, no one knows the whereabouts of Gen. Manuel Noriega. Clearly he is hiding from the verdict of the Panamanian people.

Wherever he is, I hope he has access to the same news we are getting here. President Bush over the weekend has given him some good advice.

As I read it, the President is telling Noriega that he can run and he can hide: that he can escape to one of the two or three countries that don't have an extradition treaty with the United States, and that the long arm of American law will not be able to serve its indictment on him there.

President Bush is making Noriega an offer he should not refuse. If General Noriega has the best interests of the Panamanian people at heart, or if he simply wants to save his own skin, I suggest he carefully consider President Bush's suggestion.

DELAYING EFFECTIVE DATE OF SECTION 27 OF THE OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY ACT

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 968) to delay the effective date of section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order that the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. FRANK] may have an opportunity to explain this request.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared at this point to defer to the majority leader or the minority leader.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think some words of explanation might be in order, considering the unusual undertaking of both sides of the aisle to consider some very limited legislative business today.

This is an unusual circumstance that came to our attention at the last moment. It does involve a 60-day postponement of regulations which otherwise would take effect tomorrow. I think it is in the interest of proper administration. It is supported by both the majority and the minority, by the committees, and by the other body, and it is important that we go forward with this delay.

If there should be a rollcall vote ordered on this legislation, I believe it will be our intention to move that it be postponed until tomorrow. In any event, it is important that we make as much progress as we can today, and I hope the legislation may be enacted today.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Under my reservation, I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to embrace wholeheartedly the statement of the majority leader and indicate that it is an extraordinary circumstance under which the gentleman has taken or we jointly have taken this action today. As the majority leader indicates, if there should be a rollcall vote, that would be taken tomorrow, although I suspect that we may very well get by without it.

□ 1210

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON] will allow me to proceed, I am appearing here on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Let me note, Mr. Speaker, that the bill we are now considering, if we get the unanimous consent, is the one that came from the other body just 4 or 5 minutes ago, and I hope that the other body will in the future show similar expeditious consideration in legislation which leaves us. If we get

this kind of comity, we will be in good shape for the rest of the year.

Mr. Speaker, last year legislation was passed by the Committee on Government Operations, and then through both branches, which puts strict regulations on potential abuses involving government procurement. The great majority of people, obviously, who work for us in the procurement area are quite honest, as are the great majority of most who do business with the Government, but it is our responsibility to protect ourselves and the taxpayers against the minority who would abuse. Legislation was passed last year that would do that. It called for regulations to be promulgated. The law was signed into effect in November 1988, and it had an effective date 188 days after the enactment, but the regulations did not come until March 24, 1989. There was a 4-month delay.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, we have regulations which are now supposed to go into effect tomorrow which have concerned some people, some small business people in particular, who point out quite correctly that they do not have the resources to monitor the Federal regulations in the detail that others do. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, in the statement which I have inserted, has said that he does not regard this as a first step in amending or repealing the legislation. He is doing this and agreeing to do it at the request of the Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget for the sole purpose here of giving an additional 60 days so that people can become familiar with the regulations. He, as I say, does not see this as an invitation to change them. Obviously other Members are free to do as they wish, but I did want to make it clear that in the view of the chairman of the committee this is being done, accommodating the request by the administration. The other body acted late last week. That is why we are imposing on the Members, as the two leaders explained, having promised them that there would be no legislative business. We are doing legislative business, but of a minimal sort.

Mr. Speaker, we make today no substantive change in any piece of legislation. We simply postpone for 60 days the effective date of regulations carrying out legislation which in itself remains unchanged.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for that explanation.

The administration is in favor of this bill. It gives them 60 more days to get the provisions of the rules incorpo-

rated into the organization. It is their request. Congress has agreed to do it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 968. This bill would extend for 60 days the effective date of the procurement integrity provisions contained in section 6 of Public Law 100-679, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act Amendments of 1988.

These provisions, which will become effective on May 16, contain both criminal and civil sanctions for certain proscribed activities dealing with: First, gifts or other gratuities offered to or solicited by Federal procurement officials; second, the receipt of contract source selection information by Federal contractors; and third, so-called revolving door practices of Federal employees.

Although the statute, which was signed into law on November 17, 1988, contained an effective date of 180 days after the date of enactment, proposed regulations were not promulgated until March 24, 1989—over 4 months after enactment. These regulations meet with much industry criticism and some provisions were substantially revised in response to these comments. However, the revised rules were not published as interim regulations until May 11—just 5 days before the scheduled implementation date of the law.

Both DOD and OMB have contacted the Committee on Government Operations requesting that Congress extend the effective date for another 60 days so that both government and industry could have an opportunity to train their personnel regarding the new regulations. Given the fact that the law carries with it both civil and criminal penalties, we are urged to give Government and industry some breathing room before these regulations become effective.

I strongly support this law and believe that the regulations, for the most part, adequately and fairly carry out its provisions. The committee has been assured both by the administration and by industry representatives that the requested extension is not masking an intent to seek legislative repeal or modification of the act or otherwise work substantial changes to the regulations.

It is important to note that we are at this point because of bureaucratic delay by the writers of the regulations, and that the law was and remains necessary because of the unethical and illegal practices of some of the larger contractors to the Government. While I have little sympathy for these unethical business practices and for a request by the administration to extend the effective date because of its own delay in writing regulations, I am very much concerned that small business concerns be afforded an equitable opportunity to study and become acquainted with the new regulations and the law.

These small firms, generally, do not subscribe to the Federal Register and can ill afford to maintain a presence in Washington, DC, to monitor regulatory change. They deserve a fair chance to know the rules of the game especially when a violation of these rules carries with it severe civil penalties and prison terms. Small business should not be made to pay for the mistakes and inattention of the regulation writers or for unethical practices of some big businesses.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support S. 968. If the bill is enacted, I would also call upon the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to direct an educational program primarily designed to advise smaller businesses of the terms of the new regulations. Finally, I would expect that each agency head will use the extension to train its personnel, and I can assure the House that the Committee on Government Operations will monitor this activity very closely.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 6(b) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100-679; 102 Stat. 4068) is amended by striking out "180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 16, 1989".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on S. 968, the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PATTERN OF PERVASIVE POLITICS OVER PROFESSIONALISM IN THE PARK SERVICE

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned that the proud tradition of the National Park Service has been damaged by the increasing politicization of this agency. Political considerations are overwhelming professional judgment. The pervasive pattern of politics over professionalism in the National Park Service is very disappointing. A revised vacancy announcement for the Assistant Director of Visitor Services of the National Park Service is the most recent point of concern. When this position was first advertised last November, this job announcement called for applicants from the Department of the Interior. As of today, it has been changed so that applicants from all sources—anywhere—can apply specifically to this

unique accommodation of political friends. The job announcement also says that those who applied before—and there were many applicants—need not apply again—there included but unfortunately not likely to pass the new political test that is reflected in this revised announcement.

This change—subtle in its wording but not its potential effects—is more than a slap at the professionalism of the National Park Service—it is a outright assault. By specifying all sources the administration is telling all of us that they do not believe that well qualified people exist in the National Park Service—for this position of Assistant Director of Park Service.

This position oversees many of the key functions of the National Park Service—for park ranger activities including park fees, law enforcement, fire management; for land acquisition including mining and mineral issues; for maintenance and engineering, and for concessions. In other words the person in this position oversees everything from the fires, such as those at Yellowstone Park last year, to the antidrug efforts, to food and lodging for park visitors. The Assistant Director is also responsible for such controversial issues as grazing uses and wilderness management. This position covers many of the key purposes of the National Park Service. This position must not become a political plum reward instead of a professional position. This sends a chilling message of politics first and professionalism second with National Park Service.

I am writing to the Office of Personnel Management to request an investigation of this situation which I fear is simply a preselection of an outside person for the position of Assistant Director for visitor services. I find it both surprising and preposterous that the person who should be a park ranger's ranger can now be an outsider to the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, this coming Thursday the Subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands will be reviewing new legislation, H.R. 1484, that would prevent the continued political erosion of the National Park Service. It is apparently needed today in this new administration as much as has been evident the past decade.

REV. BARBARA ST. ANDREWS

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the appreciation of the House to the Reverend Barbara St. Andrews who has honored the House today by being our guest chaplain.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Barbara St. Andrews is a member of the Episcopal Di-

ocese of San Francisco, and she has been the guest chaplain in the other body, in the U.S. Senate, as well as the guest chaplain here.

She is the first woman chaplain to do so. Members present today have observed an historic appearance by a guest chaplain. We are honored by her presence and her ministration to the House, and we wish to express our sincere appreciation and thanks to her.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING ICC TO REVIEW MAJOR RAILROAD TRANSACTIONS

(Mr. TAUKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, many of us from the Midwest have been watching with concern the efforts of a New York investment firm to effectuate a hostile takeover of a major midwestern railroad, the Chicago & Northwestern [CNW]. The CNW is by far the dominant railroad in my home State of Iowa with 40 percent of the current operating rail lines, but it has also become a major shipper of coal from Wyoming—adding a new element of competition to shipments from the Powder River Basin—and is a critical east-west rail bridge.

A number of midwestern Congressmen and Senators have expressed concerns about the public interest aspects of the proposed CNW takeover and have asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to examine this hostile leveraged takeover. However, it appears that the ICC may soon conclude that it does not have sufficient statutory authority to scrutinize this transaction to ensure that this sale serves the public interest. The reason for this is a technicality—that the company attempting this hostile takeover is not currently a rail carrier. Therefore, it does not fall under the statutory guidelines requiring ICC approval. The proposal to take over the CNW will add hundreds of millions of dollars in new debt to the railroad and will likely bring about a drastic restructuring of its current system. Obviously, if our policies designed to protect the public interest mean anything, this transaction should be subject to ICC review.

To accomplish that goal, I am today introducing legislation to rectify this shortfall in the authority of the ICC to review major railroad transactions and to ensure that the public interest is protected.

RAISING THE EXEMPTION FOR CHILDREN FROM \$1,950 TO \$3,000

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the day after Mother's Day, and I cannot think of any more appropriate time to introduce legislation to substantially raise the allowance for children on income tax returns for American families.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would raise this exemption from \$1,950, as on the returns we just filed, to \$3,000.

Edwin Feulner, chairman of the Heritage Foundation, wrote recently in the Washington Times that, if this credit had been indexed for inflation, it would be \$6,300 today. My bill is a modest and fair increase to less than half that amount.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to media impressions, the vast majority of American children are well fed, well clothed, and well cared for. The mothers and fathers of America are doing a good job, but they could do more and better things for their children if the Government did not take so much of their money.

We do not have a daycare crisis in this country today, and we certainly do not need some massive and expensive day-care bureaucracy in this Nation. All this would really do is end up helping a bunch of bureaucrats who would get higher paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, what we really need is to encourage people to have more children and to allow American families to keep a little more of their own money so that they can do more for their own children.

□ 1220

GEN. VARTAN RETIRING AFTER 35 YEARS' SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKELTON). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend one of our country's truly outstanding and dedicated military officers, Brig. Gen. Walter G. Vartan, Air Force Reserve after 35 years of service.

General Vartan was born July 17, 1932, in Chicago. He graduated from Amundsen High School, Chicago, and went on to Grinnell (Iowa) College, where he earned his bachelor of arts degree in business and was commissioned as a second lieutenant through the Reserve Officer Training Corps Program in 1954. He continued his formal education at Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, pursuing an advanced degree in management. He completed Nuclear Weapons School in 1956; Air Command and Staff College in 1972 and Senior Officer Professional Military Education at the Air War College in 1983.

In 1955, General Vartan entered pilot training at Malden Air Force Base, MO., earning his wings in August 1956. His first operational assignment after graduation was to the Strategic Air Command's 307th Bombardment Wing, Lincoln Air Base, NE, flying in B-47's.

The general joined the Air Force Reserve in 1963 and was assigned to the 928 Troop Carrier Group at Chicago-O'Hare International Airport. In November 1974 he became commander of the 64th Tactical Airlift Squadron at Chicago-O'Hare, and in November 1977 he was assigned as deputy commander for operations, 928th Tactical Airlift Group. From October 1979 to May 1980, he was assigned as mobilization augmentee to the deputy chief of staff, operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force Reserve, Robins Air Force Base, GA. General Vartan then returned to Chicago-O'Hare International Airport as commander of the 928th Tactical Airlift Group. He assumed his present duties in July 1981.

General Vartan is a command pilot with more than 4,000 flying hours in T-34's, T-28's, C-119's and C-130's. He also has additional time in A-37's, F-4's, HH-3's and KC-135's. He was qualified as a flight instructor in C-119's and C-130's.

After 35 years of service, Brigadier General Vartan, currently mobilization assistant to the deputy to the chief of Air Force Reserve will retire from active service.

The general's civic affiliations include numerous positions in the Reserve Officers Association culminating in election to national president in 1983. He is active in the Air Force Association having received a National Air Force Association Outstanding Chapter Award as president of Chicagoland O'Hare chapter. He received an Air Force Association Presidential Citation for his role in the creation of defense symposiums in the Great Lakes region. General Vartan received the Chicagoland and Armed Forces Council Award for achievement as a civilian and military leader in promoting awareness of military and community relations. He was selected by the chief of Air Force Reserve as Air Reserve Citizen of the Year for 1983. He also serves on the Air Force Reserve Objective Plan Committee. The general is active in technical and managerial organizations associated with his civilian professional field.

General Vartan is married to the former Karen Hofmann of Haddonfield, NJ. He has four daughters: Jeanene Marie, Victoria Lee, Valerie Jean, and Marianne Irene.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend General Vartan for his years of outstanding and dedicated service to the Air Force, the Congress and his country. He is one of the best of this country's citizen airmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS of New York addressed the House. His remarks will

appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IMPORTANT WORK BY ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON MILITARY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I begin a series of discussions on the House floor concerning work by the Armed Services Committee, and particularly the Panel on Military Education, which I had the honor to chair over the past year.

I might give some background and history of it and do some initial discussion because this has been a very important piece of work by the Armed Services Committee and will have far-reaching and long-lasting positive effects on our military.

Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1987 the House Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] established this Panel on Military Education and he appointed this speaker as chairman and seven other members of the Armed Services Committee on this bipartisan panel. The creation of this panel signified recognition by Congress that rigorous high quality professional military education is vital to the national security. It is an investment in the future military leadership for both war and peace.

The committee interest in professional military education is a direct consequence of its earlier work from 1982 until 1986 on the defense reorganization issue. This culminated with the passage of what is now known as the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. Congress reached back on the lessons concerning the importance of joint military operations and implemented those in the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

The primary objective of that 1986 Act is to strengthen the joint elements of the military, especially the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commanders in Chief, also known as CINC's, of the Combat Commands. The primary method of that act is to change organizations and their responsibilities. The organizational changes are found in title II, Military Advice and Command Function, which designated the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the principal military adviser to the President and the National Security Council and the Secretary of Defense. It gave the Commanders in Chief, or the CINC's, as we call them, clear command authority over subordinate commands and forces assigned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to benefit fully from these organizational changes, Congress believes it had to

improve the performance of officers assigned to joint elements. The required personnel changes are contained in title IV of that 1986 act, entitled "Joint Officer Personnel Policy." Those personnel changes are designed to insure quality in two related factors, both experience and education.

This study conducted by our panel focuses on education. Education is important, both for learning facts and for affecting attitudes, as well as values.

Specifically, joint education can broaden an officer's knowledge beyond his own military service in joint multi-service matters and can help the officer develop a joint perspective.

Using educational change to supplement and reinforce organizational change is not unique to the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

Back in 1898, the Spanish-American War made it clear that the Army's organization suffered from divided authority, that it could not meet the 20th-century needs.

Secretary of War Roots established the Army War College in 1901, and by 1903 had legislation creating a Chief of Staff and the Army General Staff. All three changes increased integration of the Army.

After World War II, the Joint Schools were established; namely, the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 1946 and the Armed Forces Staff College in 1947, which is located in Norfolk, VA.

Further, the National Security Act of 1947, later amended in 1949, created the Secretary and Department of Defense and formally established the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Again, both organizational and educational steps were unifying ones.

Military leaders are not the only ones who have emphasized the importance of military education. Winston Churchill, among others, made it clear about the importance of military education and how the military officer was educated to successfully prosecute World War II.

This panel, appointed by Chairman ASPIN, was asked to review the overall professional military personnel of our Nation, and that we did. The panel's charter, setup by the chairman, asked that we study two areas of professional military education. The first was to assess the ability of the current Department of Defense military education system to develop professional military strategists, joint war fighters and tacticians.

Along this line, I became quite concerned a little over a year ago and made a series of five speeches on strategy and the need to educate future American strategists, and out of those speeches came this panel and our charter.

The second was to review the Department of Defense plans for implementing the joint professional military educational requirements set forth in title IV of the Goldwater-Nichols Act with a view toward assuring that this education provides the proper linkage between the service competent officers and competent joint officers.

The third area of inquiry, though not specifically stated, but was quite implicit in the terms of the panel's charter and also explicit upon examination, was the area of quality. Accordingly, the report addresses all three of these areas, Mr. Speaker: strategy, jointness and quality.

The scope of the study was to determine where to concentrate our efforts. The panel had to relate the areas of its examination to levels of existing professional military education schools. The first level of military education, precommissioning education, is accomplished in service academies and the ROTC Corps, which are units of civilian colleges and the officer candidate schools.

□ 1230

There are levels of military education after the commissioning. The first is the primary level where courses are normally attended within the first 8 years after commissioning, and they are focused on the officers' branch for specialties such as armor, infantry, artillery, submarines, and the like. The second level is that of intermediate level, and the courses there are normally attended between the 10th and the 15th year of service when the officer is a major in the Army or Air Force or lieutenant commander in the Navy or major in the Marines, and at the Army Intermediate School at Fort Leavenworth, the primary focus is not on how a single branch operates but on how various branches such as infantry and armor and artillery fight together in what they call combined arms as a team. The third level, the senior level, are courses normally attended between the 16th and 23d year of service when the officer is a lieutenant colonel or colonel or a Navy commander or captain. While the curricula vary, the war colleges generally study about operational art and strategy.

The three service war colleges, the two joint colleges, the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces make up the senior category of schools. The Marine Corps, I might point out at this point, has no senior school, but it does a good job of sending its officers to the other senior schools.

There is a fourth level known as the general officer or flag officer level, and the services created short courses for flag officers, and by the 1980's, it

had established a joint staff course known as Capstone for newly selected general and flag officers.

Our panel, the military education panels, settled on the highest three levels, the intermediate, senior and general flag officer, and we did not look at the primary or precommissioning education. The panel's focus on formal military education excluded detailed inquiry into a number of closely related areas. It did not talk about on-the-job experience, which is so very important. It did not talk about self-development, although I might point out that Gen. Carl Vuono of the Army Chief of Staff put a great deal of importance on development of an Army officer's career in his testimony before our panel a few months ago. This also did not touch on the specialized joint military schools such as the management college at Fort Belvoir or the Intelligence College at Bolling Air Force Base and the like, and did not talk about the foreign professional military schools or the service graduate education institutions.

Mr. Speaker, after the panel was chartered, the Committee on Armed Services established this program under this panel, and we did ask that we be allowed to proceed for hearings and to visit the various schools, which we did. We conducted some 28 hearings, had 48 witnesses at those hearings, and interviewed over 100 civilian and military, both active duty and retired, people in connection with our study. The panel also visited all 10 of the senior and intermediate-level military schools and held hearings at most of them, with the exception of those here in the Washington area, where we held the hearings here on Capitol Hill.

We also attended classes. We talked separately with the school faculties, senior staff, and students, and the panel supplemented the visits with data, interviews and briefings, and previous reports, as well as other literature that we were able to obtain. We heard the testimony from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all four service chiefs, four commanders in chief, four CINC's of combat commands, civilian educators, former service chiefs, civilian defense officials and military educators. Mr. Speaker, we also visited and were briefed at various British, French, and West German military schools, and had the opportunity to compare their professional military education with the American intermediate and senior-level military schools.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks today with the understanding that I will continue speaking on this subject from time to time and hopefully we will have a full discussion for our Members to understand and have within the RECORD so we will know the full extent of the work of the Panel on

Military Education done by the Committee on Armed Services, which I chair.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE GERALD W. HEANEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a distinguished American jurist, Judge Gerald W. Heaney, of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. On December 31, 1988, Judge Heaney assumed senior status after serving for 22 years as a circuit court judge.

Gerald Heaney was born January 29, 1918, in Goodhue, a rural community in southeastern Minnesota. In that productive farming area of the State of Minnesota, Jerry Heaney learned the value of a close family, honesty, and hard work, qualities which have characterized his private life and which have been the hallmark of his public service.

Judge Heaney received his undergraduate education at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN, and later his law degree from the University of Minnesota, in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, at the outbreak of World War II, Jerry Heaney entered the U.S. Army, rising to the rank of captain. As a member of a distinguished ranger battalion, Jerry Heaney participated in the historic D-Day landing at Normandy. For his war service, he was decorated with the Silver Star for extraordinary bravery in the Battle of La Pointe du Hoc at Normandy, and he also won the Bronze Star and five Battle Stars.

At the end of the war Judge Heaney returned home to marry Eleanor Schmitt, now his wife of some 43 years. He entered into private law practice in Duluth, spending 20 years with the firm of Lewis, Hammer, Heaney, Weyl & Halverson, and during that time he was instrumental in improving the educational system in Minnesota, working with the Governor and the State legislature to pass a State school aid formula which remains in use today and is a model for the whole country, and serving on the distinguished board of regents of the University of Minnesota.

As a lawyer in private practice, Judge Heaney concentrated in the area of labor law, dedicating himself to service of the disadvantaged. He also represented the teachers in Duluth and helped the Duluth school district become the first in Minnesota to adopt the same pay scale for both men and women.

In 1966, with the support of Senators Eugene McCarthy and Walter Mondale, as well as then Vice Presi-

dent Hubert H. Humphrey, and my predecessor, Congressman John A. Blatnik, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Judge Heaney to a newly created vacancy on the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

On the bench Judge Heaney has been a leader in protecting the rights of the disadvantaged. The essence of his career was summed up by his own words in a recent interview that:

My view is that if we are going to preserve our democracy, the single most important thing we can do is make sure that every person has equal opportunity for an education, a job, and a home. I felt an obligation for those in our society who are poor, who are less educated, who do not have the advantages that some of the rest of us have had, but who, nevertheless, deserve the protection of the Constitution.

Throughout his tenure on the court, Judge Heaney has gained a reputation as a hard-working, well-prepared, and fair-minded jurist. He has been a leader in handling school desegregation cases in St. Louis, Little Rock, Kansas City, and Omaha. He takes pride in pointing out that in St. Louis today 12,000 black students are enrolled in suburban schools, and class sizes in the inner-city schools have dropped from 35 to 22 students.

Judge Heaney has been a leader in assuring fair treatment for Social Security claimants and in assuring decent and humane conditions of confinement for prisoners. He also authored the opinion in a decision in *In re Ahlers*, which served as a model for protections that this body afforded family farmers in the recently enacted chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Judge Heaney has left his mark on the landscape of the law. His colleague, Donald P. Lay, chief judge for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, said it beautifully:

In my judgment he is the most outstanding judge ever to serve, not only on the Eighth Circuit but throughout the United States, in the last 25 years. He is the most well-prepared judge in the circuit. His industry and dedication to law are unparalleled. His compassion and understanding of human problems is unique. He is a scholar and true gentleman in all respects.

□ 1240

Former Vice President Walter Mondale said of Judge Heaney:

I have served many years in public life and one of the best things I did was to support the nomination of Gerald W. Heaney to be a Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit. His career has been brilliant, it has been energetic, but above all it has been just. He has shown that special depth, that seasoning, and that caring that is rare. We want all of our Judges to show that wisdom and depth, but few have demonstrated those qualities as fully as Judge Heaney.

As Judge Heaney assumes senior status and has time to spend more of his time with his warm, and gracious, and beautiful Eleanor, and gives a bit

more of his seemingly limitless energy and attention to his two children, Carole and Bill, and four grandchildren, Megan, Erin, Kelly, and Matthew, I wanted to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House, and through the House this entire country to the appreciation that I have and that I think all fellow citizens should have for Gerald W. Heaney's years of dedication and service to the citizens of his State and his country. We look forward to many more years of good health and good service as he assumes senior judge status.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 106

Mr. PANETTA submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106), setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 101-50)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106), setting forth the Congressional Budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

That the Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1990 is established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1991 and 1992 are set forth.

MAXIMUM DEFICIT AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. The following levels and amounts in this section are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution, shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,065,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,144,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,216,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,329,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,426,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,479,400,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,165,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,233,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,282,300,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$99,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$88,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$65,800,000,000.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 3. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1989, October 1, 1990, and October 1, 1991:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$776,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$831,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$884,400,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$5,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$6,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$6,300,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$69,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$75,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$79,900,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,041,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,116,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,148,400,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$945,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,001,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,041,600,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$168,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$169,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$157,200,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$3,122,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$3,374,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$3,600,700,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1989, October 1, 1990, and October 1, 1991, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,300,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$107,300,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$93,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$115,000,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$97,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$119,600,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,900,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares that the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1990 through 1992 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$305,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$299,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$319,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$310,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$332,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$322,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$60,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$93,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$66,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$96,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$69,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,700,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1991:
 (A) New budget authority, \$136,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$113,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1992:
 (A) New budget authority, \$149,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$128,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1990:
 (A) New budget authority, \$185,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$145,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$155,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$220,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$164,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$22,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$197,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$197,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$214,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$214,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$226,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$226,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

(A) Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS

SEC. 4. It is the sense of the Congress that—
(1) Congress shall present the revenue portion of the reconciliation bill to the President at the same time as the spending reduction provisions of the reconciliation bill; and

(2) the specific measures composing the governmental receipts figure will be determined through the regular legislative and constitutional process, and agreements reached between the administration and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance on revenue legislation reconciled pursuant to this resolution will be advanced legislatively when supported by the President of the United States.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 5. (a) Not later than July 15, 1989, the committees named in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b)(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (C) any combination thereof,

(11)(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (i) changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (ii)

changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (iii) any combination thereof, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$2,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990 and \$0 in budget authority and \$2,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 and \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1991.

(C) In addition to the instructions in subparagraphs (A) and (B), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient (i) to reduce outlays, (ii) to increase revenues, or (iii) any combination thereof, as follows: \$400,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 and \$400,000,000 in fiscal year 1991.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS

SEC. 6. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) from time to time the United States Government should sell assets to nongovernment buyers; and

(2) the amounts realized from such asset sales will not recur on an annual basis and do not reduce the demand for credit.

(b) For purposes of allocations and points of order under section 302 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from asset sales or prepayments of loans shall not be allocated to a committee and shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority or outlays under a committee's allocation under section 302 of such Act.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms "asset sale" and "prepayment of a loan" shall have the same meaning as under section 257(12) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987); and

(2) the terms "asset sale" and "prepayment of a loan" do not include asset sales mandated by law before September 18, 1987, and routine, ongoing asset sales and loan prepayments at levels consistent with agency operations in fiscal year 1986.

RESERVE FUND FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 7. (a)(1) In the Senate, it is assumed that budget authority and outlays may be allocated to the Senate Committee on Finance for increased funding for children, including funding through tax credits, if the Committee on Finance or the committee of conference reports funding legislation that—

(A) will, if enacted, make funds available for that purpose; and

(B) to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this resolution, will not increase the deficit in this resolution for fiscal year 1990, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1990 through 1992.

(2) Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if such a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of such Act as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained

in this resolution. The Committee on Finance shall report revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of such Act for the appropriate fiscal year (or years) to carry out this section.

(b)(1) In the House, budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority shall be allocated to the House Committee on Ways and Means for increased funding for children's programs, including funding through tax credits, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports legislation that—

(A) will, if enacted, make funds available for that purpose; and

(B) to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this resolution, will not increase the deficit in this resolution for fiscal year 1990, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1990 through 1992.

(2) Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of such Act as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution. The Committee on Ways and Means shall report revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of such Act for the appropriate fiscal year to carry out this section.

RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID

SEC. 8. (a) In the Senate, budget authority and outlays may be allocated to the Senate Committee on Finance for increased Medicaid funding if the Committee on Finance or the committee of conference reports Medicaid funding legislation that—

(1) will, if enacted, make funds available for that purpose; and

(2) to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this resolution, will not increase the deficit in this resolution for fiscal year 1990, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1990 through 1992.

(b) Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if such a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of such Act as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution. The Committee on Finance shall report revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of such Act for the appropriate fiscal year (or years) to carry out this section.

SEC. 9. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that in the event that a committee of the House of Representatives acts in response to section 5 of this resolution to report to the House Committee on the Budget recommendations for legislation that would provide for increased Medicaid funding, the Senate shall adopt a revision of the instructions in section 5 of this resolution changing the instructions for the Senate Committee on Finance to incorporate the assumption for Medicaid increases reflected in this resolution and reflected in the allocations to the Committee

on Finance under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

And the Senate agree to the same.

LEON E. PANETTA,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
MARTY RUSSO,
ED JENKINS,
MARVIN LEATH,
CHARLES SCHUMER,
BARBARA BOXER,
JIM SLATTERY,
JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
BILL FRENZEL,
BILL GRADISON,
BILL GOODLING,
WM. THOMAS,
JACK BUECHNER,
AMO HOUGHTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
DON RIEGLE,
PAUL SIMON,
TERRY SANFORD,
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
PHIL GRAMM,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The following tables show the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference agreement. The fiscal year 1990 columns show the budget aggregate and functional allocations for the budget resolution for fiscal year 1990. The columns for fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992 show budget aggregates and functional allocations which the conferees consider appropriate for those years.

Conference agreement

Fiscal year 1990:	Billions
Budget authority.....	1,329.4
Outlays.....	1,165.2
Revenues.....	1,065.5
Deficit.....	-99.7
Debt subject to limit.....	3,122.7
Fiscal year 1991:	
Budget authority.....	1,426.2
Outlays.....	1,233.1
Revenues.....	1,144.7
Deficit.....	-88.4
Debt subject to limit.....	3,374.3
Fiscal year 1992:	
Budget authority.....	1,479.4
Outlays.....	1,282.3
Revenues.....	1,216.5
Deficit.....	-65.8
Debt subject to limit.....	3,600.7

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT TOTAL BUDGET

(In billions of dollars)

	1990	1991	1992
Budget authority.....	1,329.4	1,426.2	1,479.4
Outlays.....	1,165.2	1,233.1	1,282.3
Revenues.....	1,065.5	1,144.7	1,216.5

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT TOTAL BUDGET—Continued

[In billions of dollars]			
	1990	1991	1992
Deficit ¹	-99.7	-88.4	-65.8
050 National Defense:			
Budget authority	305.5	319.2	332.5
Outlays	209.2	310.2	322.4
150 International Affairs:			
Budget authority	18.3	18.6	19.7
Outlays	16.7	16.7	17.1
250 General Science, Space and Technology:			
Budget authority	14.4	15.0	15.6
Outlays	14.1	14.9	15.3
270 Energy:			
Budget authority	6.1	6.3	6.9
Outlays	4.2	4.3	4.7
300 Natural Resources and Environment:			
Budget authority	17.2	18.0	18.7
Outlays	17.4	18.3	18.7
350 Agriculture:			
Budget authority	18.3	20.6	21.3
Outlays	15.0	16.6	16.0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit:			
Budget authority	13.3	25.5	25.1
Outlays	8.5	20.2	20.5
400 Transportation:			
Budget authority	29.9	30.6	31.7
Outlays	29.0	29.8	30.9
450 Community and Regional Development:			
Budget authority	7.2	7.1	7.3
Outlays	6.7	6.8	6.9
500 Education, Training, Employment and Social Services:			
Budget authority	41.5	42.9	43.8
Outlays	38.9	42.0	43.3
550 Health:			
Budget authority	57.7	63.0	69.2
Outlays	56.0	61.9	68.0
570 Medicare:			
Budget authority	123.9	136.3	149.6
Outlays	98.5	113.0	128.0
600 Income Security:			
Budget authority	185.6	217.3	220.5
Outlays	145.6	155.5	164.6
650 Social Security:			
Budget authority	317.0	345.3	374.2
Outlays	249.1	266.6	284.0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services:			
Budget authority	31.1	32.2	33.2
Outlays	30.0	31.7	32.9
750 Administration of Justice:			
Budget authority	10.7	11.8	12.4
Outlays	10.1	11.7	12.3
800 General Government:			
Budget authority	10.1	10.4	10.9
Outlays	9.8	10.3	10.2
900 Net Interest:			
Budget authority	181.0	191.3	197.0
Outlays	181.0	191.3	197.0
920 Allowances:			
Budget authority	-21.2	-44.0	-68.0
Outlays	-19.3	-47.2	-67.9
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts:			
Budget authority	-38.2	-41.2	-42.2
Outlays	-45.3	-41.5	-42.6

¹ Debt increase as one measure of the deficit: The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows: 1990, 264.3; 1991, 251.6; 1992, 226.4.

² Gross interest on the public debt: The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows: 1990, 262.5; 1991, 282.7; 1992, 297.9.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON-BUDGET ¹

[In billions of dollars]			
	1990	1991	1992
Budget authority	1,041.4	1,116.0	1,148.4
Outlays	945.0	1,001.5	1,041.6
Revenues	776.3	831.8	884.4
Deficit ²	-168.7	-169.7	-157.2
050 National Defense:			
Budget authority	305.5	319.2	332.5
Outlays	299.2	310.2	322.4
150 International Affairs:			
Budget authority	18.3	18.6	19.7
Outlays	16.7	16.7	17.1
250 General Science, Space and Technology:			
Budget authority	14.4	15.0	15.6
Outlays	14.1	14.9	15.3
270 Energy:			
Budget authority	6.1	6.3	6.9
Outlays	4.2	4.3	4.7
300 Natural Resources and Environment:			
Budget authority	17.2	18.0	18.7
Outlays	17.4	18.3	18.7

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON-BUDGET ¹—Continued

[In billions of dollars]			
	1990	1991	1992
350 Agriculture:			
Budget authority	18.3	20.6	21.3
Outlays	15.0	16.6	16.0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit:			
Budget authority	13.3	25.5	25.1
Outlays	8.5	20.2	20.5
400 Transportation:			
Budget authority	29.9	30.6	31.7
Outlays	29.0	29.8	30.9
450 Community and Regional Development:			
Budget authority	7.2	7.1	7.3
Outlays	6.7	6.8	6.9
500 Education, Training, Employment and Social Services:			
Budget authority	41.5	42.9	43.8
Outlays	38.9	42.0	43.3
550 Health:			
Budget authority	57.7	63.0	69.2
Outlays	56.0	61.9	68.0
570 Medicare:			
Budget authority	123.9	136.3	149.6
Outlays	98.5	113.0	128.0
600 Income Security:			
Budget authority	185.6	217.3	220.5
Outlays	145.6	155.5	164.6
650 Social Security:			
Budget authority	5.4	4.3	5.0
Outlays	5.4	4.3	5.0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services:			
Budget authority	31.1	32.2	33.2
Outlays	30.0	31.7	32.9
750 Administration of Justice:			
Budget authority	10.7	11.8	12.4
Outlays	10.1	11.7	12.3
800 General Government:			
Budget authority	10.1	10.4	10.9
Outlays	9.8	10.3	10.2
900 Net Interest:			
Budget authority	197.5	214.2	226.8
Outlays	197.5	214.2	226.8
920 Allowances:			
Budget authority	-19.4	-42.0	-66.0
Outlays	-17.5	-45.2	-65.9
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts:			
Budget authority	-32.9	-35.3	-35.8
Outlays	-40.1	-35.7	-36.1

¹ The on-budget numbers exclude the trust fund surpluses.

² Deficit levels excluding trust fund surpluses: The amounts of the surpluses of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows: 1990, 69.0; 1991, 81.3; 1992, 91.4.

The amounts of the deficits excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows: 1990, -168.7; 1991, -169.7; 1992, -157.2.

The amounts of the deficits excluding the receipts and disbursements of all Federal trust funds are as follows: 1990, -239.6; 1991, -238.1; 1992, -224.9.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT OFF-BUDGET

[In billions of dollars]			
	1990	1991	1992
Budget authority	288.0	310.2	331.0
Outlays	220.2	231.6	240.7
Revenues	289.2	312.9	332.1
Deficit (-)/Surplus (+)	+69.0	+81.3	+94.1
050 National Defense:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
150 International Affairs:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
250 General Science, Space and Technology:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
270 Energy:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
300 Natural Resources and Environment:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
350 Agriculture:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
370 Commerce and Housing Credit:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
400 Transportation:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
450 Community and Regional Development:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT OFF-BUDGET—Continued

[In billions of dollars]			
	1990	1991	1992
500 Education, Training, Employment and Social Services:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
550 Health:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
570 Medicare:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
600 Income Security:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
650 Social Security:			
Budget authority	311.6	341.0	369.2
Outlays	243.7	262.3	279.0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
750 Administration of Justice:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
800 General Government:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
900 Net Interest:			
Budget authority	-16.5	-22.9	-29.8
Outlays	-16.5	-22.9	-29.8
920 Allowances:			
Budget authority	-1.8	-2.0	-2.0
Outlays	-1.8	-2.0	-2.0
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts:			
Budget authority	-5.3	-5.9	-6.4
Outlays	-5.2	-5.8	-6.5

SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION BY FUNCTION

[In billions of dollars]			
Function	1990	1991	1992
Budget authority	1,327.4	1,423.5	1,476.4
Outlays	1,164.9	1,234.3	1,281.7
Revenues	1,065.5	1,144.3	1,216.0
Deficit	-99.4	-90.0	-65.7

050 National Defense:			
Budget authority	305.5	317.8	330.5
Outlays	299.2	311.0	322.1
150 International Affairs:			
Budget authority	18.3	18.6	19.7
Outlays	16.7	16.7	17.1
250 General Science, Space and Technology:			
Budget authority	14.2	14.8	15.5
Outlays	14.0	14.8	15.1
270 Energy:			
Budget authority	6.1	6.4	7.0
Outlays	4.2	4.2	4.6
300 Natural Resources and Environment:			
Budget authority	17.4	18.3	19.1
Outlays	17.4	18.5	19.0
350 Agriculture:			
Budget authority	18.3	20.6	21.3
Outlays	15.0	16.5	15.9
370 Commerce and Housing Credit:			
Budget authority	21.0	26.4	16.9
Outlays	18.1	17.9	12.4
Transportation:			
Budget authority	30.4	31.0	32.1
Outlays	29.1	30.0	31.2
450 Community and Regional Development:			
Budget authority	7.3	7.2	7.3
Outlays	6.6	6.9	6.9
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services:			
Budget authority	40.7	42.0	42.9
Outlays	38.7	41.2	42.4
550 Health:			
Budget authority	57.5	62.9	69.0
Outlays	55.8	61.8	67.9
570 Medicare:			
Budget authority	122.4	134.8	148.1
Outlays	98.2	112.6	127.7
600 Income Security:			
Budget authority	185.4	216.1	220.4
Outlays	145.6	155.4	164.3
650 Social Security:			
Budget authority	317.0	345.3	374.2
Outlays	249.4	267.3	285.2
700 Veterans Benefits and Services:			
Budget authority	30.8	31.7	32.7
Outlays	30.0	31.4	32.5
750 Administration of Justice:			
Budget authority	11.1	12.0	12.6
Outlays	10.4	11.9	12.5
800 General Government:			
Budget authority	10.2	10.7	11.3
Outlays	9.9	10.5	10.7

SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION BY FUNCTION—Continued

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
900 Net Interest:				
Budget authority	181.0	191.04	197.0	
Outlays	181.0	191.4	197.0	
920 Allowances:				
Budget authority	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1	
Outlays	-1.4	-0.6	-0.6	
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts:				
Budget authority	-66.8	-84.4	-101.1	
Outlays	-72.8	-85.1	-102.2	

HOUSE-PASSED RESOLUTION BY FUNCTION

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
Budget authority	1,350.925	1,470.125	1,547.075	
Outlays	1,165.250	1,232.725	1,281.275	
Revenues	1,065.525	1,144.675	1,216.450	
Deficit	-99.725	-88.050	-64.825	
050 National Defense:				
Budget authority	305.500	319.175	332.500	
Outlays	299.200	310.175	322.425	
150 International Affairs:				
Budget authority	18.300	18.100	18.850	
Outlays	16.700	16.575	16.675	
250 General Science, Space and Technology:				
Budget authority	14.400	15.050	15.675	
Outlays	14.125	14.925	15.325	
70 Energy:				
Budget authority	5.775	6.000	6.600	
Outlays	3.800	3.925	4.350	
300 Natural Resources and Environment:				
Budget authority	17.050	17.850	18.525	
Outlays	17.525	18.250	18.575	
350 Agriculture:				
Budget authority	18.050	20.350	21.075	
Outlays	14.950	16.350	15.725	
370 Commerce and Housing Credit:				
Budget authority	13.250	25.450	25.050	
Outlays	8.125	19.625	19.875	
400 Transportation:				
Budget authority	29.850	30.525	31.675	
Outlays	29.000	29.750	30.800	
450 Community and Regional Development:				
Budget authority	7.150	7.050	7.250	
Outlays	6.775	6.850	6.825	
500 Education, Training, Employment and Social Services:				
Budget authority	41.975	43.325	44.275	
Outlays	39.075	42.475	43.750	
550 Health:				
Budget authority	57.825	63.125	69.325	
Outlays	56.200	62.050	68.125	
570 Medicare:				
Budget authority	123.850	136.250	149.550	
Outlays	98.350	112.775	127.825	
600 Income Security:				
Budget authority	185.675	217.400	220.775	
Outlays	145.525	155.575	164.700	
650 Social Security:				
Budget authority	316.975	345.250	374.200	
Outlays	249.075	266.575	284.025	
700 Veterans Benefits and Services:				
Budget authority	31.225	32.325	33.350	
Outlays	29.975	31.775	32.925	
750 Administration of Justice:				
Budget authority	10.375	11.525	12.075	
Outlays	9.925	11.450	12.000	
800 General Government:				
Budget authority	10.050	10.425	10.875	
Outlays	9.650	10.225	10.175	
900 Net Interest:				
Budget authority	181.025	191.300	196.875	
Outlays	181.025	191.300	196.875	
920 Allowances:				
Budget authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Outlays	-19.275	-47.200	-67.925	
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts:				
Budget authority	-37.375	-40.350	-41.425	
Outlays	-44.575	-40.700	-41.775	

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT CREDIT SUMMARY

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
Function 150:				
Direct Loans	1.9	2.0	2.0	
Primary Guarantees	6.4	6.7	6.9	
Secondary Guarantees	.2	.2	.2	
Function 270:				
Direct Loans	2.0	2.1	2.3	

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT CREDIT SUMMARY—Continued

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
Function 300:				
Direct Loans	.1	.1	.1	
Function 350:				
Direct Loans	10.1	10.2	9.7	
Primary Guarantees	5.4	5.5	5.4	
Function 370:				
Direct Loans	3.3	3.3	3.4	
Primary Guarantees	60.5	66.4	69.6	
Secondary Guarantees	93.0	96.9	100.7	
Function 400:				
Direct Loans			.1	
Function 450:				
Direct Loans	1.0	1.1	1.1	
Primary Guarantees	.5	.5	.5	
Function 500:				
Direct Loans				
Primary Guarantees	13.1	13.6	13.9	
Function 550:				
Direct Loans				
Primary Guarantees	.4	.4	.4	
Function 600:				
Direct Loans	.1	.1	.1	
Function 700:				
Direct Loans	.8	.7	.7	
Primary Guarantees	21.0	21.9	22.9	
Total:				
Direct Loans	19.3	19.6	19.5	
Primary Guarantees	107.3	115.0	119.6	
Secondary Guarantees	93.2	97.1	100.9	

SENATE PASSED CREDIT SUMMARY

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	990	1991	1992	
Function 150:				
Direct Loans	2.0	2.1	2.2	
Primary Guarantees	6.4	6.7	6.9	
Secondary Guarantees	.2	.2	.2	
Function 270:				
Direct Loans	2.0	2.1	2.3	
Primary Guarantees				
Function 300:				
Direct Loans	.1	.1	.1	
Function 350:				
Direct Loans	10.0	10.2	9.7	
Primary Guarantees	4.9	4.9	5.0	
Function 370:				
Direct Loans	3.3	3.3	3.4	
Primary Guarantees	60.5	66.4	69.6	
Secondary Guarantees	93.0	96.9	100.7	
Function 400:				
Direct Loans	(¹)	.1	.1	
Function 450:				
Direct Loans	1.0	1.1	1.1	
Primary Guarantees	.5	.5	.5	
Function 500:				
Direct Loans	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	
Primary Guarantees	12.9	13.4	13.7	
Function 550:				
Direct Loans	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	
Primary Guarantees	.4	.4	.4	
Function 600:				
Direct Loans	.1	.1	.1	
Function 700:				
Direct Loans	.8	.7	.7	
Primary Guarantees	21.0	21.9	22.9	
Total:				
Direct Loans	19.3	19.8	19.7	
Primary Guarantees	106.6	114.2	119.0	
Secondary Guarantees	93.2	97.1	100.9	

¹ Less than \$50 million.

HOUSE PASSED CREDIT SUMMARY

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
Function 150:				
Direct Loans	1.775	1.800	1.850	
Primary Guarantees	6.425	6.675	6.950	
Secondary Guarantees	NA	NA	NA	
Function 270:				
Direct Loans	2.000	2.100	2.250	
Primary Guarantees				
Function 300:				
Direct Loans	.050	.075	.075	
Function 350:				
Direct Loans	10.050	10.225	9.675	
Primary Guarantees	5.400	5.475	5.425	
Function 370:				
Direct Loans	3.200	2.300	3.375	
Primary Guarantees	60.500	66.350	69.625	
Secondary Guarantees	NA	NA	NA	

HOUSE PASSED CREDIT SUMMARY—Continued

[In billions of dollars]				
Function	1990	1991	1992	
Function 400:				
Direct Loans	.050	.050	.050	
Function 450:				
Direct Loans	1.000	1.050	1.100	
Primary Guarantees	.5	.525	.550	
Function 500:				
Direct Loans	.025	.025	.025	
Primary Guarantees	13.125	13.550	13.850	
Function 550:				
Direct Loans	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	
Primary Guarantees	.375	.400	.400	
Function 600:				
Direct Loans	.050	.050	.050	
Function 700:				
Direct Loans	.825	.750	.700	
Primary Guarantees	21.000	21.900	22.900	
Total:				
Direct Loans	19.025	19.425	19.150	
Primary Guarantees	107.325	114.875	119.700	
Secondary Guarantees	NA	NA	NA	

¹ Less than \$12.5 million.

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

The House resolution included reconciliation instructions to eight House committees to report legislation to achieve savings in fiscal years 1990-92. The Senate amendment included instructions to eight Senate Committees for fiscal year 1990. The conference agreement includes reconciliation instructions directing ten House Committees for a period of two years and eight Senate Committees for fiscal year 1990.

The House resolution required that instructed committees respond by June 30, 1989. The Senate amendment required instructed committees to report by June 15, 1989. The conference agreement provides that committees must report by July 15, 1989.

RECONCILIATION IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY SENATE COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]		
	1990	
Spending:		
Budget authority	-5,966	
Outlays	-8,481	
Revenues (REV)	-5,300	
Total deficit reduction	-13,781	
Agriculture:		
Agriculture programs:		
Budget authority	-1,100	
Outlays	-1,020	
Banking:		
Unspecified reconciliation:		
Budget authority	0	
Outlays	-187	
Commerce:		
Unspecified reconciliation:		
Budget authority	-450	
Outlays	-450	
Environment and Public Works:		
Unspecified reconciliation:		
Budget authority	-450	
Outlays	-450	
Finance:		
Medicare savings:		
Budget authority	0	
Outlays	-2,300	
Unspecified reconciliation:		
Budget authority	0	
Outlays	-468	
Revenues (REV)	-5,300	
Total, Finance	-8,068	
Governmental Affairs:		
Federal pension and postal reform:		
Budget authority	0	
Outlays	-1,100	
Postal Service off-budget:		
Budget authority	-3,400	
Outlays	-1,770	
Total, Governmental Affairs:		
Budget authority	-3,400	
Outlays	-2,870	

RECONCILIATION IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY SENATE
COMMITTEE—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	1990
Labor and Human Resources:	
Unspecified reconciliation:	
Budget authority.....	-70
Outlays.....	-70
Veterans:	
Housing loan sales:	
Budget authority.....	-496
Outlays.....	-496
Unspecified reconciliation:	
Budget authority.....	0
Outlays.....	-170
Total, Veterans:	
Budget authority.....	-496
Outlays.....	-666

RECONCILIATION IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY HOUSE
COMMITTEE

(In millions of dollars)

	1990	1991
Spending:		
Budget authority.....	-5,703	-2,910
Outlays.....	-7,750	-4,760
Unspecified Ways and Means deficit reduction (DR).....	-400	-400
Revenues (REV).....	-5,300	-5,300
Total deficit reduction.....	-13,450	-10,460
Agriculture:		
Unspecified user fees:		
Budget authority.....	-68	-68
Outlays.....	-68	-68
Repeal Bumpers amendment:		
Budget authority.....	-500	-500
Outlays.....	-420	-483
Farm program savings:		
Budget authority.....	-600	-600
Outlays.....	-600	-600
Total, Agriculture:		
Budget authority.....	-1,168	-1,168
Outlays.....	-1,088	-1,151
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:		
National Flood Insurance Fund:		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-187	-17
Education and Labor:		
GSL fees:		
Budget authority.....	-40	-40
Outlays.....	-40	-40
Energy and Commerce:		
NRC user fees:		
Budget authority.....	-299	-299
Outlays.....	-299	-299
SEC user fees:		
Budget authority.....	-50	-50
Outlays.....	-50	-50
FCC user fees:		
Budget authority.....	-50	-50
Outlays.....	-50	-50
Medicare savings ¹ :		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-2,300	-2,300
Total, Energy and Commerce:		
Budget authority.....	-399	-399
Outlays.....	-2,699	-2,699
Government Operations:		
Postal Service off-budget ¹ :		
Budget authority.....	-3,400	-550
Outlays.....	-1,770	570
Interior and Insular Affairs:		
NRC user fees ¹ :		
Budget authority.....	-299	-299
Outlays.....	-299	-299
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:		
Coast Guard user fees:		
Budget authority.....	-200	-200
Outlays.....	-200	-200
Post Office and Civil Service:		
Federal pension and postal reform:		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-1,100	-500
Postal Service off-budget ¹ :		
Budget authority.....	-3,400	-500
Outlays.....	-1,700	570
Total, Post Office and Civil Service:		
Budget authority.....	-3,400	-550
Outlays.....	-2,870	70
Veterans' Affairs:		
VA housing loan origination fees:		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-170	-170
Veterans vendee loan sales:		
Budget authority.....	-496	-553

RECONCILIATION IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY HOUSE
COMMITTEE—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	1990	1991
Outlays.....	-496	-553
Total, Veterans:		
Budget authority.....	-496	-553
Outlays.....	-666	-723
Ways and Means:		
Medicare savings ¹ :		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-2,300	-2,300
Unspecified Ways and Means deficit reduction (DR).....	-400	-400
Revenue increases (REV).....	-5,300	-5,300
Total, Ways and Means spending:		
Budget authority.....	0	0
Outlays.....	-2,300	-2,300

¹ Joint jurisdiction, savings counted only once in total savings.SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY
ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FOR 1989

(In millions of dollars)

Committees	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations.....	657,542	658,138		
Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.....	12,776	14,035	23,689	18,993
Armed Services.....	46,882	32,778	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.....	8,036	4,076		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.....	1,629	-194	404	402
Energy and Natural Resources.....	1,369	991	48	48
Environment and Public Works.....	14,691	470		
Finance.....	766,610	657,788	67,151	67,175
Foreign Relations.....	8,786	8,963		
Governmental Affairs.....	65,760	42,662	0	0
Judiciary.....	2,321	2,224	98	98
Labor and Human Resources.....	3,375	2,893	5,525	5,600
Rules and Administrations.....	40	9		
Small Business.....	0	0		
Veterans' Affairs.....	1,918	1,564	16,219	15,539
Select Indian Affairs.....	436	436		
Not allocated to committees.....	(262,771)	(261,633)		
Total.....	1,329,400	1,165,200	113,134	107,855

SENATE COMMITTEE CREDIT AUTHORITY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FOR 1990

(In millions of dollars)

Committees	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations.....	8,621	68,609		
Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.....	9,001	4,208		
Armed Services.....				
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.....	515	19		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.....	2			
Energy and Natural Resources.....				
Environment and Public Works.....	298	0		
Finance.....				
Foreign Relations.....				
Governmental Affairs.....				
Judiciary.....				
Labor and Human Resources.....	0	13,500		
Rules and Administrations.....				
Small Business.....				
Veterans' Affairs.....	825	21,000		
Select Indian Affairs.....				
Not allocated to committees.....	37	-36		
Total.....	19,300	107,300		

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AND CREDIT
RESPONSIBILITIES TO HOUSE COMMITTEESALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE
COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CON-
GRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR: 1990

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitle- ment authority
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE Current Level (Enacted Law)			
050 National Defense.....	155	155	0
150 International Affairs.....	911	911	0
270 Energy.....	355	355	0
300 Natural Resources and Environ- ment.....	1,989	1,900	0
350 Agriculture.....	9,633	646	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit.....	3,030	2	0
400 Transportation.....	456	459	0
450 Community and Regional Develop- ment.....	1,476	1	0
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services.....	9,456	9,562	0
550 Health.....	42,269	41,818	0
570 Medicare.....	36,663	36,663	0
600 Income Security.....	45,764	45,273	0
650 Social Security.....	192	192	0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services.....	16,382	15,858	0
750 Administration of Justice.....	180	179	0
800 General Government.....	5,430	5,431	0
Subtotal.....	174,340	159,495	
Discretionary Appropriations Action (Assumed Legislation)			
050 National Defense.....	306,101	299,787	0
150 International Affairs.....	19,000	17,000	0
250 General Science, Space, and Tech- nology.....	14,300	13,985	0
270 Energy.....	5,683	5,098	0
300 Natural Resources and Environ- ment.....	17,131	17,341	0
350 Agriculture.....	2,638	2,467	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit.....	3,965	4,300	0
400 Transportation.....	12,520	28,674	0
450 Community and Regional Develop- ment.....	5,535	5,640	0
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services.....	30,217	28,500	0
550 Health.....	15,327	14,673	0
570 Medicare.....	0	2,400	0
600 Income Security.....	17,310	23,857	0
650 Social Security.....	0	2,141	0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services.....	13,300	13,140	0
750 Administration of Justice.....	10,561	10,144	0
800 General Government.....	9,296	9,158	0
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts.....	-283	-218	0
Subtotal.....	482,602	498,087	0
Discretionary Action by Other Commit- tees (Assumed Entitlement Legisla- tion)			
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services.....	-70	-70	0
550 Health.....	200	200	0
600 Income Security.....	15	15	0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services.....	457	412	0
Subtotal.....	602	557	0
Committee total.....	657,544	658,138	0
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE Current Level (Enacted Law)			
270 Energy.....	933	250	0
300 Natural Resources and Environ- ment.....	421	413	0
350 Agriculture.....	12,215	13,230	10,533
400 Transportation.....	48	48	0
450 Community and Regional Develop- ment.....	52	903	0
800 General Government.....	307	310	307
Subtotal.....	13,976	15,155	10,840
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
350 Agriculture.....	-1,168	-1,088	-600
Subtotal.....	-1,168	-1,088	-600
Committee total.....	12,808	14,066	10,240

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

050 National Defense	11,213	11,227	2
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	4	1	0
600 Income Security	35,470	21,409	21,409
700 Veterans Benefits and Services	182	138	138
Subtotal	46,869	32,775	21,549
Committee total	46,869	32,775	21,549

BANKING, FINANCE, AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

150 International Affairs	0	-496	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	14,917	13,779	0
450 Community and Regional Development	17	222	0
600 Income Security	567	634	0
800 General Government	6	6	0
900 Net Interest	21	21	0
Subtotal	15,530	14,167	0

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

370 Commerce and Housing Credit	-8,794	-9,737	399
450 Community and Regional Development	0	-187	0
Subtotal	-8,794	-9,924	399
Committee total	6,736	4,243	399

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

750 Administration of Justice	19	19	19
Subtotal	19	19	19
Committee total	19	19	19

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	25	12	5,153
600 Income Security	81	80	6,948
Subtotal	106	92	12,101

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

600 Income Security	0	0	15
Subtotal	0	0	15
Committee total	106	92	12,116

ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

370 Commerce and Housing Credit	50	49	0
550 Health	8	16	38,486
600 Income Security	12,985	12,379	9,691
800 General Government	7	7	7
Subtotal	13,050	12,451	48,184

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

270 Energy	-299	-299	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	-100	-100	0
550 Health	0	0	200
Subtotal	-399	-399	200
Committee total	12,651	12,052	48,384

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

150 International Affairs	7,979	8,604	0
600 Income Security	805	356	356
800 General Government	4	4	0
Subtotal	8,787	8,964	356
Committee total	8,787	8,964	356

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

800 General Government	20	17	0
Subtotal	20	17	0

Committee total	20	17	0
-----------------	----	----	---

HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	8	9	0
800 General Government	32	0	64
Subtotal	40	9	64
Committee total	40	9	64

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

270 Energy	219	-117	0
300 Natural Resources and Environment	195	143	9
450 Community and Regional Development	432	432	367
550 Health	3	3	0
800 General Government	664	676	698
Subtotal	1,512	1,137	1,073

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

370 Commerce and Housing Credit	205	202	0
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	870	940	0
600 Income Security	31	9	5
750 Administration of Justice	692	550	98
800 General Government	523	523	523
Subtotal	2,321	2,224	626
Committee total	2,321	2,224	626

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

300 Natural Resources and Environment	362	385	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	56	53	0
400 Transportation	0	67	404
600 Income Security	12	3	0
800 General Government	6	6	0
Subtotal	437	514	404

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

400 Transportation	-200	-200	0
Subtotal	-200	-200	0
Committee total	237	314	404

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

370 Commerce and Housing Credit	3,400	1,770	0
550 Health	0	-552	3,229
600 Income Security	53,335	31,891	31,891
800 General Government	12,387	12,387	0
Subtotal	69,122	45,496	35,120

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

370 Commerce and Housing Credit	-3,400	-1,770	0
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	0	-1,100	-550
Subtotal	-3,400	-2,870	-550
Committee total	65,722	42,626	34,570

PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

270 Energy	703	375	0
300 Natural Resources and Environment	182	179	0
400 Transportation	17,099	-0	0
450 Community and Regional Development	4	4	0
800 General Government	1	1	0
Subtotal	17,989	559	0
Committee total	17,989	559	0

SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

250 General Science, Space, and Technology	70	70	0
270 Energy	65	65	0
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	1	1	0
Subtotal	136	136	0
Committee total	136	136	0

VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

700 Veterans Benefits and Services	2,414	2,213	18,702
Subtotal	2,414	2,213	18,702

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

700 Veterans Benefits and Services	-496	-666	457
Subtotal	-496	-666	457
Committee total	1,918	1,547	19,159

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Current Level (Enacted Law)

500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	1,089	0	4,077
570 Medicare	137,447	112,017	111,650
600 Income Security	28,948	19,497	42,842
650 Social Security	324,456	254,434	248,063
750 Administration of Justice	117	116	0
800 General Government	372	222	333
900 Net Interest	264,632	264,632	264,632
Subtotal	757,061	650,918	671,597

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

570 Medicare	0	-2,300	-2,300
9 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	0	-400	-400
Subtotal	0	-2,700	-2,700
Committee total	757,061	648,218	668,897

UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEES

Current Level (Enacted Law)

050 National Defense	-11,969	-11,969	0
150 International Affairs	-9,589	-9,319	0
250 General Science, Space, and Technology	30	45	0
270 Energy	-1,857	-1,826	0
300 Natural Resources and Environment	-2,943	-2,915	0
350 Agriculture	-5,018	-255	0
370 Commerce and Housing Credit	-78	-97	0
400 Transportation	-23	-48	0
450 Community and Regional Development	-317	-315	0
500 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	-100	-55	0
550 Health	-7	-58	0
570 Medicare	-50,210	-50,279	0
600 Income Security	-9,724	-9,803	0
650 Social Security	-7,648	-7,668	0
700 Veterans Benefits and Services	-1,139	-1,095	0
750 Administration of Justice	-868	-907	0
800 General Government	-18,955	-18,949	0
900 Net Interest	-83,653	-83,653	-63,368
920 Allowances	-21,200	-19,300	0
950 Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	-37,568	-43,233	0
Subtotal	-262,838	-261,699	-63,368

Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)

300 Natural Resources and Environment	-137	-137	0
550 Health	-100	-100	0
Subtotal	-237	-237	0
Committee total	-263,075	-261,936	-63,368
Total—Current level	860,890	684,641	757,268
Total—Discretionary action	468,510	480,560	-2,779
Grand total	1,329,400	1,165,200	754,489

ALLOCATION OF CREDIT RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 1990

(In millions of dollars)

House committee	Direct loans	Primary guarantees
Current level (enacted law):		
Agriculture.....	9,001	4,208
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.....	515	19
Education and Labor.....	0	13,120
Energy and Commerce.....	2	380
Merchant Marine and Fisheries.....	2	0
Public Works and Transportation.....	298	0
Veterans' Affairs.....	825	21,000
Way and Means.....	(1)	0
Unassigned.....	38	-36
Subtotal.....	10,679	38,691
Discretionary action (assumed legislation) appropriations.....	8,621	68,609
Subtotal.....	8,621	68,609
Grand total.....	19,300	107,300

¹ Less than \$500,000.

FUNCTION 050

The House-passed resolution included \$305.5 billion in budget authority and \$299.2 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment and conference agreement each included \$305.5 billion in budget authority and \$299.2 billion in outlays. These levels correspond to those set forth in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement between the President and the Joint Leadership of Congress.

FUNCTION 150

The House-passed resolution included \$18.3 billion in budget authority and \$16.7 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment and conference agreement each included \$18.3 billion in budget authority and \$16.7 billion in outlays. These levels correspond to those set forth in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement between the President and the Joint Leadership of Congress.

FUNCTION 250

The House-passed resolution included \$14.4 billion in budget authority and \$14.125 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$14.2 billion in budget authority and \$14.0 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$14.4 billion in budget authority and \$14.1 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 270

The House-passed resolution included \$5.775 billion in budget authority and \$3.8 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$6.1 billion in budget authority and \$4.2 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$6.1 billion in budget authority and \$4.2 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 300

The House-passed resolution included \$17.05 billion in budget authority and \$17.525 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$17.4 billion in budget authority and \$17.4 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$17.2 billion in budget authority and \$17.4 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 350

The House-passed resolution included \$18.05 billion in budget authority and \$14.95 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$18.3 billion in budget authority and \$15 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$18.3 billion in budget authority and \$15 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 370

The House-passed resolution included \$13.25 billion in budget authority and \$8.125 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$21 billion in budget authority and \$18.1 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$13.3 billion in budget authority and \$8.5 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 400

The House-passed resolution included \$29.85 billion in budget authority and \$29 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$30.4 billion in budget authority and \$29.1 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$29.9 billion in budget authority and \$29 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 450

The House-passed resolution included \$7.15 billion in budget authority and \$6.775 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$7.3 billion in budget authority and \$6.6 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$7.2 billion in budget authority and \$6.7 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 500

The House-passed resolution included \$41.975 billion in budget authority and \$39.075 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$40.7 billion in budget authority and \$38.7 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$41.5 billion in budget authority and \$38.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 550

The House-passed resolution included \$57.825 billion in budget authority and \$56.2 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$57.5 billion in budget authority and \$55.8 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$57.7 billion in budget authority and \$56 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 570

The House-passed resolution included \$123.85 billion in budget authority and \$98.35 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$122.4 billion in budget authority and \$98.2 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$123.9 billion in budget authority and \$98.5 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 600

The House-passed resolution included \$185.675 billion in budget authority and \$145.625 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$185.4 billion in budget authority and \$145.6 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$185.6 billion in budget authority and \$145.6 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 650

The House-passed resolution included \$316.975 billion in budget authority and \$249.075 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$317 billion in budget authority and \$249.4 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$317 billion in budget authority and \$249.1 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 700

The House-passed resolution included \$31.225 billion in budget authority and \$29.975 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$30.8 billion in budget authority and \$30 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$31.1 billion in budget authority and \$30 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 750

The House-passed resolution included \$10.375 billion in budget authority and

\$9.925 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$11.1 billion in budget authority and \$10.4 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$10.7 billion in budget authority and \$10.1 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 800

The House-passed resolution included \$10.05 billion in budget authority and \$9.65 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$10.2 billion in budget authority and \$9.9 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$10.1 billion in budget authority and \$9.8 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 900

The House-passed resolution included \$181.025 billion in budget authority and \$181.025 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment and conference agreement each included \$181 billion in budget authority and \$181 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 920

The House-passed resolution included \$0.000 in budget authority and \$-19.275 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$-0.3 billion in budget authority and \$-1.4 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$-21.2 billion in budget authority and \$-19.3 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 950

The House-passed resolution included \$-37.375 billion in budget authority and \$-44.575 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment included \$-66.8 billion in budget authority and \$-72 billion in outlays. The conference agreement includes \$-38.2 billion in budget authority and \$-45.3 billion in outlays.

REVENUES

The House-passed resolution, Senate amendment, and conference agreement each provided for a fiscal year 1990 revenue level of \$1,065.5 billion. Consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Agreement between the President and the Joint Leadership of Congress, this level assumes a \$5.3 billion increase from changes in tax law and a \$0.5 billion increase from an IRS tax compliance initiative. Revenue resulting from an appropriation for this initiative, which is not within the jurisdiction of the tax-writing committees, is not subject to, nor credited towards, reconciliation.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

The Conferees accepted the economic assumptions used in the House- and Senate-passed resolutions as the basis for the aggregate budget estimates. These economic assumptions were the basis for the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, and were prepared by the administration for the budget revisions submitted to the Congress in February. The economic assumptions are displayed in the table below.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

(Calendar years)

	Actual 1988	Projected			
		1989	1990	1991	1992
Annual averages:					
Gross national product (billion dollars).....	4,860	5,219	5,577	5,947	6,304
Percent change.....	7.4	7.4	6.9	6.6	6.0
Real GNP (billion 1982 dollars).....	3,994	4,126	4,257	4,399	4,541
Percent change.....	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2
GNP deflator (percent change).....	3.4	4.0	3.6	3.2	2.7
Consumer Price Index (percent change).....	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.2	2.7

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS—Continued

(Calendar years)

	Actual 1988	Projected			
		1989	1990	1991	1992
Civilian Unemployment Rate (percent).....	5.5	5.3	5.2	5.0	5.0
3-month Treasury bill rate (percent).....	6.7	7.4	5.5	4.5	4.0
10-year Treasury note rate (percent).....	8.9	8.6	7.2	6.0	5.0
Taxable incomes (billion dollars):					
Wages and salaries.....	2,436	2,609	2,783	2,973	3,163
Corporate profits before tax.....	302	352	399	442	475
Fourth quarter to fourth quarter (percent change):					
Gross national product.....	6.8	7.3	7.0	6.4	5.8
Real GNP.....	2.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2
GNP deflator.....	4.1	3.7	3.5	3.0	2.5
Consumer Price Index.....	4.3	3.6	3.5	3.0	2.5
Civilian unemployment rate (percent, fourth quarter level).....	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.0	5.0

REPORT LANGUAGE

The Conferees intend that language in the reports of the Senate and House Committees on the Budget on the concurrent resolution on the budget that has not been modified by this conference report remains as a source of legislative history on the drafters' intent on the concurrent resolution.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The House resolution contained one provision stating the sense of the Committee on the Budget regarding items provided in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement Between the President and the Joint Leadership of Congress.

The Senate amendment contained 22 miscellaneous provisions regarding: the debt increase as one measure of deficit, the deficit levels excluding trust fund surpluses, the corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt, the sale of government assets, a reserve fund for subsidized housing contract renewals, a reserve fund for Medicaid, a reserve fund for IRS compliance, fuel excise taxes, further deficit reduction, Social Security trust fund surpluses, Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 funding, more truthful presentation of deficit, a reserve fund for children, funds for prison expenses, a biennial budget process, the current services baseline, World Health Organization and PLO membership, reducing the generation of carbon dioxide, the national aerospace plane, Bipartisan Budget Agreement language on revenue legislation, implementation of deficit reduction, disaster assistance, and the public debt limit.

The conference agreement contains the following four miscellaneous provisions on the sense of the Congress regarding Bipartisan Budget Agreement language on revenue legislation, the sale of government assets, a reserve fund for children, and a reserve fund for Medicaid.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT LANGUAGE

Section 23 of the Senate amendment stated the assumption that (as stated in paragraph 10 of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement) agreements reached between the administration and the Congressional tax-writing committees on revenue legislation reconciled pursuant to this resolution will be advanced legislatively when supported by the President.

Section 4 of the House resolution stated the intent of the House Committee on the Budget that (as stated in paragraph 5 of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement) Congress

shall present the revenue portion of the reconciliation bill to the President at the same time as the spending reduction provisions of the reconciliation bill, and that (as stated in paragraph 10 of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement) the specific measures composing the governmental receipts figure will be determined through the regular legislative and constitutional process, and agreements reached between the administration and the Ways and Means Committee on revenue legislation reconciled pursuant to this agreement will be advanced legislatively when supported by the President.

The conference report contains a sense of the Congress provision similar to the House provision that also notes the participation of the Committee on Finance.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS

Section 7 of the Senate amendment was a provision on asset sales identical to that in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989. That provision, in turn, was a combination of two provisions in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988. The section would prevent the use for spending in fiscal year 1990 of the proceeds from asset sales and loan prepayments. It would do this by prohibiting the counting of asset sales for purposes of the allocations to committees under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This provision is consistent with section 251(a)(6)(I) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, which prohibits counting asset sales and loan prepayments for the purposes of determining whether that Act calls for across-the-board cuts.

The House resolution had no such provision, but report language addressed this rule.

The conference report includes the provision.

RESERVE FUND FOR CHILDREN

Section 16 of the Senate amendment provided a reserve fund for children similar in form to the language for the Medicare catastrophic insurance initiative in the Senate in the concurrent resolutions on the budget for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 and the anti-drug initiative in both Houses in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989. Specifically, section 16 of the Senate amendment provided that budget authority and outlays may be allocated to the Senate Committee on Finance for increased funding for children (including funding through tax credits) if the Committee on Finance or the conference committee reports funding legislation that will make funds available for that purpose and will not increase the deficit in the resolution. When that legislation is reported and again upon the submission of a conference report, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

The House resolution had no such provision.

The conference report includes the provision plus a similar, parallel section covering the House. The House provision does not include reference to conference committees because the House conferees believe that the language regarding the Committee on Ways and Means will also cover a report submitted by the committee of conference on legislation that originated in the Committee on Ways and Means.

RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID

Section 9 of the Senate amendment set forth a reserve fund provision for Medicaid funding that is very similar to that for children in the Senate amendment and those for the Medicare catastrophic insurance initiative in the Senate in the concurrent resolutions on the budget for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 and the anti-drug initiative in both Houses in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989. Specifically, section 9 of the Senate amendment provided that budget authority and outlays may be allocated to the Senate Committee on Finance for increased Medicaid funding if the Committee on Finance or the conference committee reports funding legislation that will make funds available for that purpose and will not increase the deficit in the resolution. When that legislation is reported and again upon the submission of a conference report, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

The House resolution had no such provision.

The conference report contains the provision, applicable only in the Senate.

RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE

The conference report also contains a section stating the sense of the Senate that in the event that a House Committee intended in its response to the reconciliation instructions of this resolution to the House Committee on the Budget recommendations for legislation that would provide for increased Medicaid funding, the Senate shall adopt a revision of the reconciliation instructions in this resolution changing the instructions for the Senate Committee on Finance to incorporate the assumption for Medicaid increases reflected in this resolution and reflected in the allocations to the Committee on Finance under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

IMPLICIT MARGINAL TAX RATES ON THE INCOME OF THE ELDERLY

The Conferees request that the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means examine the combined impact on the implicit marginal tax rates on the income of the elderly caused by:

- (1) Federal income tax rates,
- (2) taxation of Social Security benefits,
- (3) the Social Security earnings test, and
- (4) the income-related premium for Catastrophic Health Insurance.

FUNDING FOR SUBSIDIZED HOUSING CONTRACT RENEWALS

It is the intent of the Senate Conferees and the Republican House Conferees that the amounts assumed in the CBO alternative baseline for subsidized housing contract renewals shall be provided for such contract renewals, consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Agreement. Further, it is the intent of the Senate Conferees that the concurrent resolutions on the budget for 1991 and the out-years will also reflect the commitment to renewing all expiring contracts when the resources necessary for renewing this assistance to low-income families will be so much greater. The Senate Leadership, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations have indicated their intention

that such funding will be provided in the appropriate legislation.

It is the intent of the Democratic House Conferees that the amounts assumed in the resolution for subsidized housing contract renewals shall be provided for such renewals without prejudice to the form or length of such renewals. Further, the House Leadership and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans, HUD and Independent Agencies of the House Committee on Appropriations have indicated their intention that such funding will be provided in the appropriate legislation.

FUNDING FOR IRS COMPLIANCE

It is the intent of the conferees that the amounts assumed in the resolution for IRS compliance shall be provided in order to raise the assumed amounts of additional revenues from increased IRS compliance funding consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Agreement. The House Leadership has indicated its intention that such funding will be provided in the appropriate legislation.

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT

The Conferees for the Senate adhere to the following positions on anti-drug and law enforcement funding, more truthful presentation of deficit, reducing the generation of greenhouse gases, implementation of deficit reduction, and disaster assistance.

ANTI-DRUG AND LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNDING

The Senate Conferees assume that sufficient funding is available to support the increases provided in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and that such funding is consistent with the need to maintain the even balance in that Act between new spending to reduce drug supply and new spending to reduce drug demand.

The Senate Conferees also assume that within function 750, there are sufficient funds available to support a Federal expenditure level of \$1 billion in drug-related correctional activities at the Federal, state and local levels.

MORE TRUTHFUL PRESENTATION OF DEFICIT

The Conferees for the Senate find that:

(1) this concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1990 is within the parameters established by the President, and even if inadequate, is essential to keep the Government in operation;

(2) this resolution sets forth the deficit at only \$99,700,000,000;

(3) one measure of the deficit, the increase in the public debt subject to limitation, is fully \$264,300,000,000;

(4) the Federal debt will rise to fully \$3,122,700,000,000 in 1990; and

(5) the level of gross interest on the public debt will be \$262,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1990;

The Conferees for the Senate believe that:

(1) as set forth in the Senate amendment, the budget submitted by the President under section 1105 of title 31 of the United States Code and the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1991, in order to more truthfully set forth the deficit, should reflect at least the following changes:

(A) all Social Security and other Federal retirement funds must be accounted for separately;

(B) all gross interest on the public debt subject to limitation must be fully reported and reflected; and

(C) the increase in the gross Federal debt that is subject to the legal debt limit should be shown as a measure of the deficit.

(2) Because a multi-year plan of debt and deficit reduction, based on sound economic assumptions, appears imperative, the President is requested to advise the Congress of any proposals relative to the reduction of the national debt, and to inform the Congress whether additional revenues are required for debt and deficit reduction, and if so, the President is invited to make specific revenue recommendations.

REDUCING THE GENERATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES

The Senate Conferees find that:

(1) the concentration of the so-called "greenhouse" gases—including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, chlorofluorocarbons, and tropospheric ozone—is rising;

(2) since the advent of the industrial revolution 150 years ago, a number of scientific experts estimate that the atmospheric concentration of

(A) carbon dioxide, the most prevalent of these gases, has increased by 25 percent;

(B) methane has increased by 100 percent;

(C) nitrous oxide has increased by 10 percent;

(D) chlorofluorocarbon compounds (CFC's) have increased from zero 60 years ago at an average rate of 5 percent per year; and

(E) tropospheric ozone continues to increase by 1 percent per year;

(3) a large number of the world's leading scientists, including members of National Science Foundation, have warned policy makers that

(A) increased concentrations of these gases will alter climate; and

(B) such climatic alterations could have devastating effects on weather patterns, agricultural productivity, coastal population centers due to rising sea levels, and biological health;

(4) the majority of these gases are generated in the production of energy;

(5) in 1988, the Department found, based on data collected for the 1985 National Energy Policy Plan, that the United States' generation of carbon dioxide would increase from 1985 levels by 38 percent in the year 2010;

(6) leading scientific experts of the world, including members of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine have urged the President to take action to reduce the generation of these gases by the United States;

(7) international negotiations are underway to develop strategies to reduce the generation of these gases;

(8) the United States is chair of the Response Strategies Working Group of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which was established by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organization;

(9) at the first meetings of the IPCC's Response Strategies Working Group, the Secretary of State urged that global solutions to global climate change be as specific and cost-effective as they can possibly be;

(10) it is imperative that the United States and all nations take immediate steps to protect the global environment; and

(11) without action by the United States to protect the global environment, our ability to convince other nations to act on concerns such as global climate change will be constrained.

The Senate conferees believe that United States policy on global warming should be:

(1) to reduce the generation of greenhouse gases;

(2) to hold, in 1989, a global conference on the environment, hosted by the President;

(3) to encourage other nations to undertake measures to reduce the generation of greenhouse gases;

(4) to develop binding multilateral agreements with other nations by the end of calendar year 1992, or as early as practicable, to reduce the global generation of greenhouse gases;

(5) to encourage the worldwide protection of tropical rain forests;

(6) to require each Federal agency to examine its programs to determine the impact of global warming on its missions and activities and to evaluate and propose policies under its authority that could reduce the generation of greenhouse gases;

(7) to develop new technologies and better utilize existing technologies that will provide reliable supplies of energy and service for the citizens of the United States while reducing the generation of greenhouse gases.

The Senate conferees also believe that the United States Government should adopt a position with respect to a "Framework Global Climate Convention," and through its representative to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, should begin discussions on such a convention when it chairs the next meeting of the "Response Strategies Working Group."

To the maximum extent practical, the priorities set forth in this section should be reflected in the Federal budget.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DEFICIT REDUCTION

The conferees for the Senate find:

(1) The Bipartisan Budget Agreement represents the action most probable to avoid a budget impasse and sequester.

(2) The achievement of a reduction in the Federal budget deficit through agreement rather than confrontation between the President and Congress is in the national interest.

(3) National security and international leadership rest on the foundation of a strong economy, capable of financing internally its investment needs.

The conferees for the Senate believe that:

(1) The Bipartisan Budget Agreement should be fully and quickly implemented;

(2) The Leadership of Congress and the Administration should immediately authorize resumption of negotiations aimed at a multi-year deficit reduction package, leading to a balanced Federal budget;

(3) The economic and budgetary assumptions underlying the multi-year agreement should be based on sound and realistic forecasts; and

(4) The bipartisan, cooperative effort that made the Bipartisan Budget Agreement possible should be sustained in addressing the nation's remaining budgetary problems.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

The Senate conferees believe that legislation should be adopted to mitigate financial hardship caused by the current drought. The Senate conferees find the following:

(1) agricultural producers in several Midwestern and Southwestern States have experienced adverse weather conditions since planting the 1989 crop of winter wheat, including a lack of rainfall, freeze damage, high-velocity windstorms, and record-breaking high temperatures;

(2) such extreme conditions have combined to severely damage winter wheat production in several States, including Kansas,

Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska, Colorado, and New Mexico;

(3) the Kansas Wheat Quality Council, after a recent 3-day tour of these States, estimated that production in the Texas and Oklahoma Panhandles would be only one-third of normal;

(4) the mean average of 68 estimates of the 1989 crop of winter wheat in Kansas projected only 209,000,000 bushels of wheat; and

(5) current budget estimates reveal there will be substantial savings resulting from higher prices and lower deficiency payments that could be applied toward disaster payments for drought-stricken winter wheat producers through an extension of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note).

In light of these conditions, the Senate conferees believe that:

(1) legislation should be enacted to extend the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note) to apply to losses due to adverse weather conditions in 1988 or 1989 for agricultural commodities planted in 1988 for harvest in 1989;

(2) such legislation should not add to the deficit and such legislation should not discriminate against other program crops;

(3) such legislation should not discriminate against producers who are currently covered by Federal crop insurance; and

(4) drought assistance should be enacted in a timely fashion so as to ensure that savings from higher prices and lower deficiency payments offset the cost of such assistance.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN THE HOUSE

Rule XLIX of the House of Representatives sets forth a procedure for increasing the level of the public debt. The rule blends the public debt limit increase into the congressional budget process which, by setting the budget totals, determines what amount of debt must be outstanding.

Upon final passage by both bodies of the concurrent resolution on the budget, the public debt level for fiscal year 1990 set forth in the resolution becomes the substance of a joint resolution, is deemed passed by the House, and is sent to the Senate for its approval. If the Senate approves the joint resolution without amendment, the joint resolution is sent to the President for signature. The public debt level in the joint resolution becomes effective upon signature by the President. (If the Senate amends the joint resolution, then it would return to the House for further action.)

Pursuant to the rule, the text of the joint resolution would be as follows:

That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof \$3,122,700,000,000.

Legislative jurisdiction over the public debt remains in the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule does not preclude that committee from originating public debt bills whenever necessary.

LEON E. PANETTA,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
MARTY RUSSO,
ED JENKINS,
MARVIN LEATH,
CHARLES SCHUMER,
BARBARA BOXER,
JIM SLATTERY,
JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
BILL FRENZEL,
BILL GRADISON,
BILL GOODLING,

WM. THOMAS,
JACK BUECHNER,
AMO HOUGHTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
DON RIEGLE,
PAUL SIMON,
TERRY SANFORD,
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
PHIL GRAMM,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. SCHUMER, for 60 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. SKELTON, for 30 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on May 16.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on May 18.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, for 60 minutes, on May 24.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. ECKART.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution urging first asylum countries of the Association of Southeast Asia, Nations (ASEAN) to reinstate the practice of providing refuge to all asylum-seekers from Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution designating May 29, 1989 as the "National Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the U.S.S. Iowa."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 968. An act to delay the effective date of section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act; and

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution designating the week beginning May 14, 1989, and the week beginning May 13, 1990, as "National Osteoporosis Prevention Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1989, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1179. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a baseline deviation notice received from the Navy concerning the T45TS program, a defense enterprise program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2437; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1180. A letter from the Director for Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on real and personal property of the Department as of September 30, 1988, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2701(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990

and 1991 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for such Department for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10 and 37, United States Code, and other authorities to extend and to make permanent certain expiring laws; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1183. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for participation by the United States in a capital increase of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1184. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1185. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting an informational copy of a report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 17, 1987, which recommends modification of the previously authorized flood protection plan on the Rio Grande Floodway, Truth or Consequences Unit, NM, with other pertinent reports; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1186. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of various lease prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1187. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a repair and alteration prospectus for the B.F. Sisk Federal Building-U.S. Courthouse in Fresno, CA; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1188. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish certain positions in the Department of Defense at level IV of the Executive Schedule; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

1189. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of the report "Homelessness—HUD's and FEMA's Progress in Implementing the McKinney Act" (GAO/RCED-89-50, May 1989), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11304; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

1190. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting results of the audit of the Federal Housing Administration Fund's statement of financial position as of September 30, 1988 (GAO/AFMD-89-3, May 1989), pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 8016(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1191. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10 and title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the educational assistance programs for veterans and eligible persons, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 643. A bill to amend section 37 of the Mineral Leasing Act relating to oil shale claims, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PANETTA: Committee of conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 106 (Rept. 101-50). Order to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request): H.R. 2342. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the provisions relating to refinancing loans and manufactured housing loans to veterans, to modify the procedures for the sale of loans by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUKE: H.R. 2343. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission to include approval of the acquisition of control of certain rail carriers by persons that are not carriers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

87. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to Federal funds for interstitial cystitis public education and research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

88. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to compensation for U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the 10 amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. COX.
H.R. 49: Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 132: Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 182: Mr. WEISS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 250: Ms. SNOWE.
H.R. 534: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 646: Mr. BILLIRAKIS.
H.R. 720: Mr. STUDDS.
H.R. 799: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 854: Mr. RINALDO and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 901: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1101: Mr. OLIN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. HOPKINS.
H.R. 1102: Mr. BUECHNER.
H.R. 1292: Mr. ATKINS.
H.R. 1467: Mr. SCHUETTE.
H.R. 1593: Mr. REGULA, Mr. HILER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FROST, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. RAY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1605: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1645: Mr. SHUMWAY and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1706: Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 1730: Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1850: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1851: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 2049: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAY, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2102: Mr. PARRIS and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 2124: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 2126: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2131: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 2145: Mr. CARR, Mr. COURTER, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2238: Mr. HENRY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HERTTEL, Mrs. SAIKI, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2290: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KASICH, Mr. WISE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. COYNE.

H.J. Res. 174: Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOPKINS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RAY, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. ROTH.

H.J. Res. 241: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL.

H.J. Res. 243: Mr. WILSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. AUCCOIN.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. DURBIN and Mr. BATES.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Res. 120: Mr. DICKS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Res. 122: Mrs. BYRON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

40. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Hunt County Commissioners Court, Green-

ville, TX, relative to employee benefit plans;

which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.